

DEC 27 1923

The Classical Weekly

Published weekly, on Monday, except in weeks in which there is a legal or School holiday, from October 1 to May 31, at Barnard College, New York City. Subscription price, \$2.00 per volume.
Entered as second class matter, November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the act of Congress of March 3, 1879.
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 28, 1918.

VOL. XVII, No. 10

MONDAY, DECEMBER 17, 1923

WHOLE NO. 460

PHONETIC RECORDINGS OF ROMAN PRONUNCIATION OF LATIN

by PROFESSOR SHIRLEY H. WEBER, Princeton University

Secretary of American Classical League

A unique and practical contribution to the study and appreciation of the Latin language for the purpose of increasing greater interest in Latin as well as inducing a better appreciation of the literary value of the subject.

The records, five in number, are clear and distinct in enunciation and were carefully prepared to meet the requirements of class-room instruction and to serve as an authoritative reference for oral practice.

The Contents

<i>Latin Pronunciation Quotations for Practice</i>	<i>Sentences from Caesar</i> <i>The Besieged Camp (B.G.V.48)</i>	<i>Cicero Against Catiline (Cat. 1.1-9)</i> <i>The Appeal to Jupiter Stator (Cat. 1.39)</i>
*	*	*
<i>Latin Maxims, Phrases and Colloquial Expressions</i>	<i>Bravery of Two Centurions (B.G.V.44)</i> <i>A Fable of Phaedrus (Adapted)</i>	<i>Cicero's Defense of the Study of Literature (Pro Archia VI, VII)</i>
*	*	*
<i>Short Latin Sentences</i> <i>Selections from Caesar's Gallic War (B.G.I.1; II.35)</i>	<i>Cicero's Eulogy of Caesar (Cicero Pro Marcello 4.5.6)</i>	<i>Opening Lines of the Aeneid (I.1-11)</i> <i>Description of Rumor (IV, 171-188)</i> <i>Advice of the Sibyl (VI), 126-136</i> <i>The Greatness of Rome (VI, 840-853)</i>

The Student Latin Records are sold in sets only. They may be used on any phonograph. The price, including album, is \$10; postage prepaid when remittance accompanies order, otherwise postage collect. Sold only by

Latin Department

STUDENT EDUCATIONAL RECORDS, Inc.

Lakewood, N. J.

In ordering please mention this publication.

The Pupil Who Plunges Into Caesar

with only a half-baked knowledge of the syntax he should know dislikes his second year work and seldom does it well. In the conventional edition of Caesar these principles of syntax are only briefly touched upon and are usually put at the back of the book for reference.

In Place's *Second Year Latin* the author gives six Introductory Lessons devoted to the principles of syntax which are outside first year work—the dative of purpose, the dative with compound verbs, irregular verbs, subordinate clauses in indirect discourse, etc. The use of these is illustrated in interesting short anecdotes.

*With this presentation the pupil advances
into Caesar with interest and confidence*

PLACE'S SECOND YEAR LATIN

By PERLEY O. PLACE, Litt.D.

Professor of Latin, Syracuse University

568 pages

Richly illustrated

Price, \$1.68

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON

ATLANTA

Classmates!

A High School boy and his Latin Grammar are, in a certain sense, classmates whose association is of the closest; this association need not be broken when College days arrive, if the Grammar be one that is fitted for use in College. This is just one of the many advantageous characteristics of

CONCISE LATIN GRAMMAR

by Benjamin L. D'Ooge

Concise Latin Grammar not only meets the needs of the High School student but includes all the essentials for College work, a fact very gratifying to all who have deplored the change of Grammars with its attendant confusion.

Simplicity of examples may well be mentioned too as an outstanding merit. A practical discussion of word formation, extreme clarity of statement, and an interesting history of the Latin language are other attributes which win the commendation of both teacher and student.

70 Fifth Ave. GINN AND COMPANY New York

The Classical Weekly

VOL. XVII, No. 10

MONDAY, DECEMBER 17, 1923

WHOLE NO. 460

FURTHER HELPS TO THE STUDY OF THE METAMORPHOSES OF OVID

(Concluded from page 67)

(3) In *The Classical Journal* 15.260-278 (February, 1920), Dr. E. S. McCartney published a very interesting article entitled *How and Why: "Just So" Mythology in Ovid's Metamorphoses*. In this paper Dr. McCartney is dealing with aetiological myths in Ovid, in other words with what Kipling calls "Just So Stories". In these stories Kipling, it will be remembered, tells *How the Whale got his Throat*, *How the Camel got his Hump*, *How the Leopard got his Spots*, etc.

Dr. McCartney begins as follows:

... It seems to have been inbred in the mind of primitive man to assume that striking characteristics of things in the natural world had not always been as he found them. The savage takes it for granted that there was once greater uniformity in the traits, habits, and appearance of birds, beasts, and human beings, or in the color of fruit and the properties of other things in nature. In the childhood of the world, man must have been as curious to have things explained as are children today. Some explanation, correct or incorrect, had to be given, and nothing but a very explicit explanation was satisfactory. Gradually there grew up a body of tradition which accounted for the supposed transformation from the old order to the new. Presently (260-261) Dr. McCartney states his purpose to be

... to note the aetiological stories in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and to quote parallels from all quarters of the globe. The comparative method will give some insight into the state of mind responsible for their original composition.

It would be utterly impossible, in any such notice as this, to give an adequate conception of the wealth of material which Dr. McCartney has brought together. For this wealth readers of *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* will be prepared, because they will remember his valuable papers, *An Animal Weather Bureau*, 14.89-93, 97-100, *The Folk Calendar of Times and Seasons*, 16.3-7, *Some Folk-Lore of Ancient Physiology and Psychology*, 12.18-21, 26-29, 35-38. In this notice, then, I can venture to give only the captions under which Dr. McCartney groups his material, with an indication of the pertinent parts of the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid. His themes, then, are as follows: *How the Crow Became Black* (261-262; 2.531-632; see especially 2.536-537, 549-541); *Spotted Breasts* (262-263; *Philomela*, *Progne*, *Itys*, 6.669-670); *Markings on Tails* (263-264; *The Peacock*, 1.720-723); *Color of Man* (264-265); *How the Ethiopians became black*, 2.235-236; *Cries of Birds* (265-268; *maggies*, 5.677-678; *halcyon*, 11.410-748, especially 734-735; *the heron*, 14.578-580); *Traits and Habits* (268-271); *Why the partridge flies fast and low, and builds its nest upon the ground*, 8.252-259; *Why the swan does*

not fly high

2.367-380; *Why spiders spin unceasingly* 6.5-145; *Why the hoopoe has a large beak*, 6.647-674; *Why the *ciris*, a bird as yet unidentified, has no feathers on its head*, 8.6-151; etc., etc.); *Characteristics of Trees and Flowers* (271-273); *Why the fruit of the mulberry is dark*, 4.158-165; *Why the heliotrope turns ever to the sun*, 4.206-270; *Why the anemone is frail and short-lived*, 10.737-739; *How the rose became red*, *ibidem*; *Why the laurel is an evergreen*, 1.564-565; *Why the wild olive is bitter*, 14.517-526; *Why the coral is rigid*, 4.470-752); *How Certain Things Came To Be* (273-274); *The origin of the deadly serpents of Libya*, 4.617-620; *How the laurel came into being*, 1.452-567; *Whence aconite came*, 7.404-419; *The origin of the touchstone*, 2.687-707; *How the musical properties of the reed, or Pan's pipe, were discovered*, 1.687-712); *Natural Phenomena* (274: *The source of the dew*, 13.574-622; *The origin of echo*, 3.356-369); *Religious Customs* (274-275): *Why the cypress is associated with mourning*, 10.105-142; *Why the pine is sacred to the mother of the gods*, 10.104-105; *Why the pig is sacrificed, why the goat is sacrificed*, 15.111-115); *Eponymous Legends* (275).

Having presented the material from Ovid and having, in his footnotes, richly illustrated it by accounts of similar tales in the non-classical world, Dr. McCartney continues as follows (276):

A few suggestions may be made as to the method of creation of stories of metamorphosis. In the course of migrations the various races came upon fauna and flora that were new to them. They seem to have assumed that things strange to them must at one time have resembled those with which they were familiar. We are told expressly by Ovid that the story of Pyramus and Thisbe is narrated to account for the change in the color of mulberries, which had previously been white. The narrative has an eastern setting. A tribe moving westward from a region where the white mulberry was common might have adapted it, to explain the strange new color of the fruit.

When I was writing my notes on the Pyramus and Thisbe story in my edition of *Selections from Ovid* (1923), I was very much interested to notice that not a single American editor had taken any trouble whatsoever to deal with the most important part of the Pyramus and Thisbe story—the fact that it was told to account for the change in the color of the mulberries, which had been snow-white (4.89), to a deep dark red, almost black (4.165). There was nothing on the point in the edition of Moriz Haupt as revised by H. J. Müller (seventh edition, Berlin, 1885). I got a hint—a very valuable hint—in the note by Siebelis-Polle on 4.137, which I followed up in various books. Now I have never been able to lay claim to any such knowledge of folk-lore, mythology, and kindred things as Dr. McCartney has displayed, not only in the article

under consideration, but also in his articles, referred to above, published in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY*. Hence, aided only by the Siebelis-Polle edition, I wrote on 4.89-90 the following note:

... in such a tale as this, it makes no difference whether mulberries ever were white or not. According to present knowledge, the white mulberry was brought from China to Europe in the twelfth Christian century; since the fifteenth century it has taken the place, almost entirely, of the black mulberry in silk-raising. Today the black mulberry is grown for its fruit. That fruit is white before it matures; at maturity its color is a deep, dark red (cf. 165). The black mulberry is a tall tree (cf. *ardua*, 90); the white mulberry is much shorter.

On 4.165-166 I wrote as follows:

permaturuit: see on *niveis*. . . *pomis*, 89. Perhaps O. means to give us here his interpretation of the story; if so, see §§ 324, 328, 330, 349 (on Ovid's humor).

I noted finally, on 165, that *ater* was an effective word, because constantly applied to things connected with death.

In quoting these two notes of mine, I have taken it for granted that the reader remembers, what I pointed out in my little Introduction to the notes to this selection, that Ovid himself describes the tale as not generally known (4.53), and that we know the tale now only from Ovid. I note, with great interest, that neither on page 271 nor on page 276 is Dr. McCartney himself able to throw any direct light on the Pyramus and Thisbe story.

I should attach now to the notes in my Ovid this statement—that the Pyramus and Thisbe story must be added to the Argonautic story, for instance, as one of the many evidences of active commerce between the West and the East, going far back of the times that are for us still prehistoric. I am reminded of Mr. Shewan's reference, in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 17.23, to an article in *American Journal of Archaeology* 24 (1920), 1 ff., in which Dr. Carl Blegen, of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, discussing Mycenaean occupation of Corinth, showed "that there was active commerce, by way of the Isthmus, between North and South and between East and West". But of such things Ovid, of course, could not have been thinking.

Another very interesting paragraph in Dr. McCartney's article is to be found on page 277:

The song or note of a bird may sound sad and mournful. The reason for the grief must be explained. In speaking of the fate of Procne and Philomela, Pausanias (i. 41.9) says: "The story that they were turned into a nightingale and swallow was suggested, I suppose, by the plaintive and dirgelike song of these birds". When Greek literature dawns, the nightingale and halcyon already have a well-established reputation as grief-stricken birds. Varro records a popular etymology to the effect that *lusciniola* means "grief singer".

Some stories owe their origin to a sort of word-play. *Ardea* is the name of a city and a bird. *Ciris* is connected with *seipos*, "to shear". Again, the cry of a bird may sound like the name of a person or thing, or even like a sentence, and so establish a cue for an aetiological story.

In this connection, in a footnote (277, Note 2), Dr. McCartney reminds us of a very interesting and useful

book, *The Birds of the Latin Poets*, in which Professor Ernest Whitney Martin, of the University of California, makes the statement (2) that the Romans "nearly always felt a tone of sadness in the songs of their favorite birds, where we are inclined to feel joy and ecstasy". Dr. McCartney declares that the same statement might be made to include the Greeks. This statement, so far as the Roman poets were concerned, attracted the special attention of Professor McDaniel, in his review of Professor Martin's book (*THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 10.143-144). Of course such a statement helps us to understand, better than we otherwise should, the use of *gemo*, of the note of the dove, for instance, or such a phrase as Tennyson's "the moan of doves in immemorial elms". This attitude of the Romans would make less absurd than it would otherwise seem Varro's etymology (*De Lingua Latina* 5.76) of *lusciniola*: <*lusciniola appellata est*> quod luctuose canere existimatur.

Dr. McCartney concludes his stimulating essay with the following paragraph (278):

Back of all these stories accounting for the color, cries, traits, habits, characteristics, and constitution of animals and things in the natural world, there is manifested one deep and fundamental desire, that of definiteness of information. Man in a primitive stage of society must have a specific explanation for things that attract his attention. His attitude toward nature is somewhat like Livy's toward things ancient: *si quae similia veris sint, pro veris accipiantur, satis habeam* (v.21.9).

Would Dr. McCartney restrict this "deep fundamental desire" to primitive man? Does not the desire exist to-day, with unabated force, in highly sophisticated man?

(4) In her book, *Italy Old and New* (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 16.174-175), Professor Elizabeth Hazelton Haight, of Vassar College, has a chapter entitled Ovid in Sulmona (194-206). In spite of its title, the first part of this chapter (194-202) has little, if anything, to do with Sulmo, Ovid's birthplace; it deals rather with Ovid's life and career at a distance from Sulmo. The part of the chapter which corresponds to the title begins with the following paragraph (203): Miss Haight gives no references to Ovid's works):

Some pride in his town Ovid shows, for he boasts that Sulmo is a third part of the whole Paenitrian district and he would give it, as well as Rome and Tibur and Tusculum, a Trojan founder,—"Sulymus, Aeneas' one companion from Phrygian Ida, from whom the walls of Sulmo take their name, cool Sulmo, my country. Woe is me! How far is Sulmo from this Scythian land!"

One touch of homesickness for the little town! Usually in his exile it is great Rome, the City for which he longs, and even on his sad birthday-anniversary in Tomi, he thinks of his first birthday in Sulmo only to wish, from his misery, that it might have been his last. But for Ovid's temperament people had more hold than places and with father, mother and brother dead, and wife and daughter in Rome, his thoughts fly to that second home as well as to all his more general satisfactions in the life of the great city. . . .

Professor Haight entered Sulmo, or Sulmona, as the Italians call it to-day, by the light of a full moon (203):

... I had not gathered from Ovid or from anything I had read that the beauty of the spot would be its own reward, but as I drove up the long road from station to town, I drew an enraptured breath over the two snow-capped ranges and the two poplar-bordered rivers between which the long narrow town stretched out before me in the radiant, white moonlight. . . .

By daylight, too, Professor Haight found Sulmona "as picturesque as its setting is romantic" (204). She concludes thus (205-206):

... Yet all the beauty of mountains, rivers and picturesque buildings had not so much charm for me as a rather dilapidated school house with an inscription above the door that read "Collegio Ovidio". I went into the courtyard and there to my joy found Ovid himself, a fifteenth century Ovid in long straight robe, very prim, virtuous and saintly, clasping to his breast the city's emblem, a tablet with the letters S. M. P. E. for his own words, Sulmo mihi patria est. . . .

Even in that reflective moment, I seemed to belittle the right that Sulmona has to be proud of her brilliant *alumnus* who in his greatest work re-vivified the Graeco-Roman myths and through the *Metamorphoses* was preeminently the Latin poet who influenced the art and literature of the Renaissance. I will confess that I love best of all in Ovid the traces of the country that remain,—the picture of the river in flood that kept him from his Love, the prayer of the shepherd to the Italian goddess Pales, and the account of the pious old couple who unaware entertained a god. To me none of Ovid's other works has the charm of the Baucis and Philemon story and I think that picture of the simple home, the life-long devotion, and the religious faith of two old peasants was created out of the heart of the Abruzzi mountains. . . .

I am grateful to Professor Haight for these concluding words of her paper, for they reenforce my conviction that many a writer has done injustice to Ovid by charging him, by implication or in set terms, with a lack of feeling. A pose is always a dangerous thing; if an individual maintains it often enough or long enough, the world will accept the pose as fact. Both Horace and Ovid have, in my conviction, suffered severely because each so persistently sought to avoid the appearance of deep feeling. This has led many a person to undervalue the more serious Odes of Horace, especially his great patriotic Odes, in which, in pieces small of scale, but pregnant with profound patriotism, he does again and again what Vergil twice, on a great scale, in the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid*, did for Italy and for Augustus, and it has rendered many a person impervious to the evidences of feeling in the *Metamorphoses*. Horace, in a famous passage (Serm. I.1.24-25), asked *quamquam ridentem dicere verum quid vetat?* So we might ask, What hinders one who often, or even habitually, smiles, and takes the world, in seeming or even in fact, lightly, from possessing—and displaying—at the proper time feelings profound and true?

In The Classical Journal 11.50-55 (October, 1915) Mr. Henry S. Gehman published a paper entitled Ovid's Experience with Languages at Tomi. Tomi, says Mr. Gehman, was a Milesian colony (Tristia 3.9.3). Yet, by the time Ovid came to Tomi, there were few traces there of the Hellenic tongue (Tristia 5.7.51).

... The Greek speech had yielded to the Getic and the settlers were barbarized. Ovid, in speaking of the languages of Tomi, mentions the Getic, Thracian, Sarmatian, and Scythian. He refers most frequently

to the Getic, which certainly was the language spoken in that region and which belonged to the Thraco-Phrygian group. Beyond a doubt there were Bessi (a Thracian tribe), Sarmatians, and Scythians at Tomi who spoke their native tongues and were clearly distinguished from the Getae, just as at the present time the Albanians, the Servians, the Bulgarians, the Rumanians, the Turks, and the Greeks intermingle in the Balkans without losing their national characteristics. He says that he learned to speak both Getic and Sarmatian, but in many cases he probably uses these words in a general and indefinite sense for metrical reasons. It is also possible that he did not have a clear conception of the differences between these foreign tongues. Certainly, however, the Getae and their language occupied the most important part of Ovid's attention at Tomi.

On pages 52-53 Mr. Gehman writes interestingly of the position in which Ovid found himself in his first days and months at Tomi, when he could not speak Getic, and there was no one, so he declared, who could speak to him in Latin. Dr. Gehman rightly, I think, doubts the truth of the latter statement. He declares that it is "quite probable that, on account of the importance of Rome and her language, somebody lived in Tomi who had a knowledge of Latin, at least in the vernacular of traders". Ovid, as part and parcel of his deliberate purpose to make his lot at Tomi seem as miserable as possible, insists that no one could talk in the Latin tongue. Of necessity, then, Ovid learned to talk with the people among whom he lived (Tristia 5.12.58; Epistulae ex Ponto 3.2.40). Indeed, in the end, he became so familiar, he declares, with Getic that, even when he wrote Latin verse, it seemed to him that he was writing in Getic measures (Tristia 3.14.18). Finally, Ovid actually wrote in Getic and adapted the barbaric words to the Roman meter. By so doing, he won the name of poet among the Getae.

... After he had learned the language at Tomi, Ovid probably had many interesting conversations with the natives. On one occasion when he spoke about Roman *probitas*, an old man who was born in the land of the Taurians narrated the story of Iphigenia and her escape from the Crimea. This story was still repeated among the Scythians and proved in the old man's mind that sentiment also moved the feelings of barbarians <55>.

CHARLES KNAPP

A DEFENSE OF THE PRESENT REQUIREMENTS IN LATIN AS SET BY THE COLLEGE ENTRANCE EXAMINATION BOARD¹

A logical result of this period of world chaos seems to be the question mark. We have applied it to our government, our homes, our religion, and now to the requirements of the College Entrance Examination Board! Without any constructive planning we are tearing down old standards, just because they are old, before we have any vision of what we shall build in their place. We are very much like the Irishman at Ellis Island, who was asked his political views and re-

¹This paper was read at the Seventeenth Annual meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, at Rutgers College, May 5, 1923.

plied, "I haven't made up me mind yit, only I'm agin the government".

We teachers of the Classics have recently received two rather startling suggestions from our futurist friends. The first was the abolition of the teacher who tried to put a knowledge of Latin and a love of Latin for its own sake in the minds and hearts of his pupils, on the score that he was old-fashioned, a failure, a lifeless clod, and, therefore, should be replaced with a live, up-to-date teacher, who would use Latin merely as a means of illuminating modern life, of teaching etymology, spelling, etc. Just why the ability to teach Latin, without imparting a knowledge of Latin or a love of Latin, implies the possession of 'pep', and a close contact with life, the speaker did not explain.

The second suggestion, even more startling in its possible results, is the elimination of the College Entrance Examination Board requirements as being equally old-fashioned, lifeless, a failure. Now, to me, the College Entrance Examination Board is a sign, a symbol of many things; and the least important of all that the Board does is to rob our pedagogical life of its illusions and our soul of its sweetness by mowing down our poor little innocents in entrance examinations. If I never prepared a pupil for College, or if I never succeeded in getting a pupil through those examinations, I should believe just as thoroughly in the requirements as they now stand. For the College Entrance Examination Board has always set a standard, not for College entrance examinations, but for attainments.

But why set an arbitrary standard at all? you may argue. If we could be absolutely sure that all our pupils who begin Latin would go to Colleges that require four years of Latin for entrance, all well and good! But only a small proportion of our first year pupils go to College, and a large proportion of these *could* go to Colleges that do not require Latin. Why prepare all for College, when so few enter College? Why should all our pupils be compelled to take a standard course? Why not offer less in quality or quantity to those not entering College? So runs the argument.

First of all, if any one teaches in a School where he can be absolutely certain even a month before graduation of the final list of aspirants for College, he is fortunate. In our School there is always a great number of girls who find possibilities for College opening up at the last moment, and rush around frantically trying to meet requirements. But let us assume that we could divide our beginning Latin classes into sheep and goats, to be fed real Latin and substitutes for Latin respectively. On what principle could we do the herding? Could we decide by the test of an early ambition for College? But very few fourteen-year-olds really know what they want to do four years later. Some of our best students enter High School without any definite plans for the future; and some of our worst students have parents with very early and definite plans for the future. Or could we decide by the test of a pupil's social or financial standing whether a College education is a possibility for him? Even if we could decide this (and who would take the respon-

sibility of deciding?), in this melting-pot of ours one cannot be at all sure that relative positions will remain fixed for even four years. Or could we decide by intelligence tests, or scholastic records up to date? This certainly would be the fairest of all three tests. But intelligence tests are far from infallible; a good student in Grammar School does not necessarily mean a good student in High School, and vice versa. And we all realize that the four years of High School offer greater possibilities of mental development in a pupil's life than any other four years. Even the child who starts out in High School a slow pupil, and remains a slow pupil to the plodding end, often makes good in College; these tortoises sometimes surprise us and outstrip the erstwhile hares. But, if none of these facts were true, if there were no arguments against this discrimination as being unjust and unwise, still, in this most democratic institution of ours, the Public School, we could not make a distinction between our pupils on the score of worldly position or attainment. We should have strenuous and successful objections on the part of many pupils and their tax-paying parents. Again, the average High School, with its policy of promotion by subject, and the consequent impossibility of keeping certain groups intact for four years, would find the distinction between College and non-College Latin an impossible one. So from the standpoint of efficiency, democracy, and general School economy, if we offer Latin courses at all, they must be of a standard high enough for all. We cannot offer to some a course 'above the salt', to others one 'below the salt'. Who would want to sit below the salt, anyhow?

Have those who object to the present standard anything to offer that, in proportion to the labor involved, offers as big returns in interest and achievement? Suppose that we do lower our standard for those who do not intend to go to College. Have we the right to take time from the four best years of a pupil's life and waste it in denatured Latin, on work that is not worthy of the name? We teach chemistry without intending every one of our pupils to be chemists and manual training without a solemn pledge from every pupil to devote his life to carpentry. Or do they want no definite standard at all, with our classes a free-for-all, go-as-you-please race, having no definite course and no definite goal? If we must have some standard (and I think that we all feel that we should), why should it not be set by a representative body of trained specialists and acknowledged scholars?

I have not found the standard set by this body, the College Entrance Examination Board, an unnecessarily high standard. For three years I have followed up the work of girls who have failed in any term of Latin. A failure in Latin almost invariably means a failure in another subject later, if not at the same time. I have a list of all girls who have failed in Latin, and yet have kept a perfectly clean record otherwise throughout their High School course. You would be amazed at the surprisingly small piece of paper that suffices for the record. Try it on your own pupils! The result is very heartening!

I think I can assume that the majority at least of this audience are in favor of the College Entrance Examination Board requirements as a general standard for High School, and that those who are dissatisfied are attacking their present form and not their existence. Are we absolutely honest in our condemnation of requirements all the possibilities of which we have not tried? At a recent meeting of classical teachers, a teacher of several years experience said to me, 'I'm all fed up with Caesar, Cicero, and Vergil'. When I questioned her, I found that she had taught Caesar, Cicero, and Vergil without varying a line for ten years, and yet honestly thought she was faithfully following the requirements. To keep the figures suggested, ought we not to be sure before we reject the fare offered by the College Entrance Examination Board that we have tried all the choices and combinations possible?

I think a large part of the trouble lies in the fact that somewhere in the dim past we started consuming, as our High School pabulum, four books of Caesar, six orations of Cicero without variation, and six books of Vergil; and every year, year after year, we ate our way steadily and stolidly through the same table d'hôte meal. And, even after the College Entrance Examination Board, with a change to Comprehensive Examinations, offered what was largely an à la carte service, some of us are still just as steadily and stolidly eating our way through the same old meal, indigestible and unpalatable as certain minor items on the menu may prove; and because these minor items loom large, we would reject the whole.

When the general form of College examinations was changed to a Comprehensive one, with a view to testing power rather than parrot-like repetition of a passage carefully worked over in class-room drill, we all felt that we had made a great step forward, that, with this new ideal of power, real ability could be tested and gauged. With the change there came for the teacher at least a distinct feeling of relief. Gone were the days of memorized translations—and I have known students who did just that. Gone were the days of reading yesterday's review, for, with emphasis on the power to read new Latin, there was no longer need of having a pupil memory-perfect on every line. And blessed thought! Gone was the abject faith in the 'pony', for in the new time of trouble he availed little. And right here I offer battle to those who find any excuse at all for this method of travel in the Secondary School. Any child under eighteen, who is able to use a translation intelligently, is too intelligent to need one.

But, even with the gradually increasing leeway in the choice of Latin to be read, there are some who would make even more radical changes. Why should we, they say, keep Caesar, Cicero, and Vergil as the main courses of our High School diet? There must be other authors from whom our pupils will get just as accurate a knowledge of Latin, and in addition a much greater interest and initiative. I feel very old when I hear those arguments, for in my extreme youth I used to talk that way myself, and I have aged considerably in hunting for those 'just as good' authors.

I feel very decidedly that the solution of the problem does not lie in substituting 'spoon victuals' or 'baby food' for the strong diet of the past. I feel confident that many of our failures in following out some of the new schemes, particularly in first and second year work, are due to this substitution, with the indigestion subsequent to the drop again into real food. But I also feel sure that it is possible to read our Caesar, our Cicero, and our Vergil from an entirely different standpoint. From the point of view of the pupil at least, particularly in authors available in the second year, there are scenes and characters thrillingly interesting, peaks of interest that are worth climbing. And there are plains of tedious repetition and morasses of difficulty not necessary or desirable from any point of view. Why toil over the plains or even flounder in the morasses when we have the heights?

For several years I read the conventional four books of Caesar, reading every word in every line. I used the first book as a battle-ground for all possible constructions, and in the fashion of those days put everything in Indirect Discourse that was not, and everything out of it that was. And at the end of the term I marshalled the battle-scarred but victorious remnants of my ranks. But every year I wondered a little more if it were worth while. Did those long rhetorical speeches justify all those pitiful little graves that they helped to dig and fill? As a system of mental gymnastics they were beyond compare; but the system was deadly in its results.

Then we tried omitting the first book of Caesar, only to find that we had left out some of the finest stories and characters of Caesar, as well as some really inspiring speeches that the girls could read and appreciate. Then we tried various collections of selections, only to find that the pupils became as hopelessly confused in the vague schoolboy style of Eutropius, as in the most scholarly passage of Caesar. Their interest was no greater, their initiative decidedly less, their vocabulary confused, and their accuracy in the uses of classical constructions sadly impaired by association with some of those late gentlemen who did not hesitate to murder the Emperor's Latin. I discovered that, when we came to selections from the Gallic War or the Civil War, the girls found them infinitely more interesting than most of the other selections. And so we came back to Caesar with a sense of relief and an added respect for the sanity, clarity, and real vital interest of Caesar's characters and episodes.

But why should we read any particular four books? Why should we read all of any one book? Why should we not go through the Gallic War and the Civil War and touch the high spots of character or episodes, either as separate sketches or woven together by certain leading paragraphs of the intervening chapters? Why should we sacrifice Vercingetorix or Ariovistus or inspiring tales of individual or mass heroism for details of marching back and forth?

We find that the second year is the critical year. In the third and the fourth year, the question is not what we shall read, but what we are willing to omit.

As the College Entrance Examination Board added to the readings from which we might select, I found it hard to subtract, so that every year we read more and more at sight; and I realize that, with this increased sight drill, the girls are able to do their home assignments in a much shorter time.

Surely no one, on the score of interest, can object to the requirements and choices of the third year. There is such an immense field of possibilities here in the almost limitless background of Roman life, private and public, Roman history and its great men, with their correlation in the life and the history of our day and their illumination of world life and world history. If it is at all possible for mortals to gain wisdom from the experience of a past generation, certainly there are no two hundred years in history so full of concentrated and vital lessons as the century preceding and the century following the birth of Christ. I have hundreds of clippings and pictures brought in by third year girls for their bulletin boards, showing that they do feel the nearness of those years to modern life. As for the fourth year, has anyone a substitute for Vergil and Ovid?

We try to make our girls attack their home assignment as a piece of sight work for fifteen or twenty minutes, reading it through as they would a sight selection, and trying to sense at least the general meaning before they resort to vocabulary or to notes. Of course some of the girls will never succeed at this; some will not even try. But in my classes, with lessons of average difficulty, the girls are successful enough to make it decidedly worth while. If a girl has approached a home assignment for two or three years from the angle of a project in sight reading, she will not be very badly scared at a slightly longer and more difficult sight reading problem on a College entrance examination sheet.

I think that right at this point lies one of the answers to the riddle of why our pupils apparently lose their heads in College entrance examinations. We spend four years getting our boys and girls ready for an examination, the character of which we know—a test of power; and yet in many cases we do no systematic training in preparation for that great day.

If we were teaching a child to swim, we should use either the old-fashioned method, effective but strenuous, of throwing him into deep water repeatedly until he taught himself to swim, or the more modern method of showing him the essential stroke until we taught him to swim. But, before leaving him to his own devices, we should insist on his knowing how to swim. But, in many cases, for the first time we throw our inexperienced pupils into the unknown depths of sight reading in College entrance examinations, although we have had four years in which to train them for the experience, and to get them ready for the plunge.

Sight work belongs just as emphatically in the first week of the first year as it does at the very end of the last year. From the very beginning there should be a definite place for sight work in the School curriculum or at least in the plan of class-room work. And the

little beginner should understand that it is just as much a part of his work to translate his little two-word sight sentence as it is part of the Seniors' work to translate at sight his twenty lines. I do not think any pupil should be given a grade of 'excellent' if he cannot translate well a piece of sight, no matter how perfect his home preparation; and a slow pupil should be given just as many sight translations as a bright one. Too many teachers and too many classes regard sight reading simply as a means of covering ground, all the work of which is done by the upper third of the class, while the submerged third does comfortably, and the middle third shows a polite if somewhat mild interest. If we cannot have special sight reading books with short interesting passages, each one complete in itself, certainly we should use judgment in selecting passages from our required reading, and not merely wander blindly on at the end of the lesson. Some passages are impossible for sight work, while others are such gems for work in sight reading that it is a crime to waste them on a prepared lesson.

To those teachers who are given supervised study periods, that may be used for regular sight reading drill, I will not say *Pax vobiscum*, for they must already know a rare peace. But, for many of us, sight work is something to be kept for the end of the period, *when* or *if* the lesson is finished, a hit-or-miss stop gap, so that, if a teacher is asked, 'How much time do you give to sight?', she cannot truthfully or accurately answer.

I suppose that there is not a Secondary teacher here who really has time for sight. We simply have to make time, and very *definite* time each day. There are many ways of crowding this in, dependent on the class and the character of the sight reading—sometimes by a choice little passage at the beginning of class, sometimes by a passage bearing directly on some part of the lesson, sometimes by merely an advance reading in the regular lesson. But I think it is essential that it should be a definite piece, in the early years read aloud by the teacher with as much expression as possible, so that the pupils will learn early to translate by *phrases* and not by *words*, in the later years, when they have developed some skill, read through silently by the pupils, before they attempt to translate a word. I have not succeeded in reducing it to a formula yet, but it is true, I know, that, the more time a class gives to sight reading, the more time it has for sight work; it seems to speed up home assignments and the class recitations.

I have discovered also that it is in sight work that I find the best drilling ground for Latin word-formation—prefixes, suffixes, and essential roots. If a pupil really knows his prefixes, suffixes, and the more common roots, he can make a really accurate translation of many new words. And even the pupil who would not be caught alive in any situation so undignified as working is betrayed into a real interest in reading at sight, from the mere gambling excitement of making $3 + x = 4$.

It seems to me that every subject to be truly educational ought to be able to make four demands on the interest of the pupil: (1) interest in the daily task as a project, a problem to be solved; (2) interest in the subject-matter of the lesson; (3) interest in the great background that the subject opens up; (4) interest in the direct connection of the subject with every day life. Latin, if rightly taught, ought to make these four appeals: (1) as a problem in translation, vocabulary forms, or whatever is the assignment; (2) as a literature (I do think that High School students *can* appreciate Latin as literature, certainly in the third and the fourth years); (3) as a key to the most thrilling past the world knows; (4) as a key to the present, as the mother or step-mother tongue of English, influencing its vocabulary, its spelling, its construction. Possibly it is only the rare pupil who is influenced equally by each of these appeals; probably the appeal changes with the development of the subject and of the pupil. But only an educator of colossal stupidity would neglect any of these avenues of approach in developing power or inspiration; only an educator of colossal egotism would wilfully neglect any of the four, or overdevelop any at the expense of any or all of the others. Before we say that our pupils are not interested, let us make very sure that we have done our part from *all* angles in offering *all* possibilities. Every substitute offered up to date for the College Entrance Examination Board requirements, as a standard for the Secondary School, seems to me to cheat the pupil out of at least *one* of these angles of interest, and offers no equivalent either in interest or in time saved.

I have always felt that much valuable time has been wasted in etymology classes as such, time that could be tripled in value in a Latin class. If any pupil understands word-formation in Latin, and knows the prefixes and the suffixes and the ordinary roots (an incredibly small list!), not much breath will have to be wasted in drawing for him analogies to English words; he will see them—more than that, he will *feel* them. I have always wanted to try the following experiment. Take two classes of equal ability. Teach one etymology from the English standpoint (in many of our Schools etymology is taught in the English Department). Teach the other Latin. At the end of the year, I'll wager, the Latin class could at least pass the examination in spelling and etymology of the other class; in addition it would know First Year Latin, and it would have had a few thrills; and there are no thrills in etymology.

Sometimes I wonder if we do not talk and write too much about the value of Latin. We seldom like the things that we are constantly reminded are good for us. If some choice tid-bit of food is offered to us, no one has to expatiate on its value; one bite is enough. And one bite of the thrills of Latin, taken almost at random from that great traditional and historical past, and offered to a class or to an individual at the psychological moment, is worth more to whet the jaded appetite of young America than all the monographs in the world. Whether for good or ill, the fact

that I stand here to-day a teacher of Latin is due to a great inspiration that a Latin teacher gave my little, twelve-year old soul, when she thrilled me with a description of the battle of Thermopylae, such a description as no history teacher in my experience ever even touched in dramatic appeal.

I think that many modern educators are in real danger of being misled by the externals of our modern youth into assuming that the child of to-day is inherently different from the child of yesterday. Our boys rebel against restraint a little more openly, our girls meet the issues of life a little more frankly than girls did twenty years ago, but down underneath they are the same boys and the same girls, a little finer, I think, for their openness and frankness. I am one of those optimists who believe thoroughly and absolutely in the ultimate justification of the boys and the girls of this generation. They refuse to accept blindly our arbitrary values; but, if we do our part in proving these values, they will fight for them with a spirit and an independence that we never knew.

If, with all the possibilities offered by the College Entrance Examination Board, I have failed to teach Caesar, Cicero, and Vergil, so as to make them interesting, and vital, and worth-while, then the fault lies with me, not with my pupils, and certainly not with Caesar, Cicero, or Vergil; and I should fail just as utterly to make any substitute interesting, vital, or worth-while. But, like the Mad Hatter, at the party in the Alice in Wonderland of our youth, we think that "moving up a place" will solve all difficulties. I feel very strongly that, before we lower our present high standard, or offer some mediocre substitute, we ought to make very sure of ourselves.

If we have been so unfortunate as to have missed in all its fullness the great heritage of the past, have we the right, in any autocratic control of education, to deny any or all the possibilities of that heritage to our successors? Or, if we have received the full value of the heritage, have we the right, in the arrogance of our disparaging estimate of this generation, to assume that the child who comes after us cannot or will not appreciate what has meant so much to us? Should we not rather pray in the prayer of Hector for his baby son—

"O Jupiter, and all ye deities,
Vouchsafe that they may say
This man is greater than his father was!"

WEST PHILADELPHIA HIGH
SCHOOL FOR GIRLS

GERTRUDE BRICKER

THE MOON AS EVIDENCE

The story of Lincoln's use of the almanac to acquit his client in the Armstrong murder case (THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 16.167-168) is as nearly a demonstrated fact as such things can be. It was freely asserted by Lincoln's enemies that this triumphant coup was a fraud and that the court had failed to notice that the almanac was of a wholly different year. It has also been asserted that the incident never happened, because Lincoln's earliest biographer does not mention it. Both of these assertions are completely refuted in

George P. Costigan's *Cases on Legal Ethics*, 352-355, where all the details are presented. From the same book, I transcribe the following:

"A fellow was tried for highway robbery, and the prosecutor swore positively to him, saying he had seen his face distinctly for it was a bright moonlight night. The counsel for the prisoner cross-questioned the man, so as to make him repeat that assertion and insist upon it. He then affirmed that this was a most important circumstance, and a most fortunate one for the prisoner at the bar, because the night on which the alleged robbery was said to have been committed was one in which there had been no moon; it was during the dark quarter! In proof of this he handed an almanac to the bench, and the prisoner was acquitted accordingly. The prosecutor, however, had stated everything truly; and it was known afterwards that the almanac with which the counsel came provided had been prepared and printed for the occasion". The Doctor (by Robert Southey) vol. III. p. 146, Ed. 1835, as quoted in James Ram, *A Treatise on Facts* (4th Am. Edition) 269.

The testimony of Dioclides in the case of the *Hermae*, to which Professor McCartney refers in the same number of *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY*, is also mentioned by Diodorus (13.2). Diodorus, however, differs from Plutarch in that he asserts that the testimony was disbelieved even by the jury. The silence of Andocides (*De Mysteriis* 38) on a point that would have completely cleared him induced Grote to believe that the whole story was apocryphal (*History of Greece*, 7, Chapter 58, page 199). However, the orator's silence is not conclusive. Dioclides in his subsequent trial (Andocides, *De Mysteriis* 65), confessed that he had perjured himself, and there would have been no need of mentioning this detail. Hickie, in his note on this passage, supposes that it was in this trial that the discrepancy between the testimony and the almanac was brought out. But that would directly contradict both Plutarch and Diodorus.

We have, accordingly, three incidents, all independent and all probably authentic, which are alike not only in the fact that a witness was confuted by proof that the moon did not shine on a specified night, but are further alike in the fact that the use of the evidence was questioned. These furnish a valuable commentary on the critical foible of assuming that similarity necessarily implies borrowing.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

MAX RADIN

ATHENIANS AND AMERICANS

In *The Living Age* of November 3, 1923, appears a translation of an article on 'Dollar Diplomacy', by M. Pierre Arthuys, originally published in *La Revue Universelle*, of September 15. The general theme is the enterprise of Americans in securing the so-called Chester Concessions in Anatolia, and the author takes occasion to characterize us in this way:

'Americans envisage things on a large scale. They are accustomed to carrying out vast projects. A keen desire "to possess the earth" blinds them to obstacles. Undoubtedly they meet difficulties and suffer checks, but in their eyes the past is the past. They waste no time worrying over what is lost. Their interest is in the future. They are constantly striving to outdo themselves. They have a passion for making records.

After losing a fortune, they begin again as if nothing had happened, pressing onward toward new conquests. If one trust is defeated, two others spring up in its place'.

All this is subtly flattering to American pride, for it is almost a paraphrase, unconscious or deliberate, of the unwilling tribute of the Corinthians to Athens. Hear the speech in *Thucydides* (1.70), as translated by Jowett:

They are revolutionary, equally quick in the conception and in the execution of every new plan. . . . They are bold beyond their strength; they run risks which prudence would condemn; and in the midst of misfortune they are full of hope. They are impetuous and you are dilatory; they are always abroad, and you are always at home. . . . When conquerors, they pursue their victory to the utmost; when defeated, they fall back the least. . . . When they do not carry out an intention which they have formed, they seem to have sustained a personal bereavement; when an enterprise succeeds, they have gained a mere instalment of what is to come; but if they fail, they at once conceive new hopes and so fill up the void. With them alone to hope is to have, for they lose not a moment in the execution of an idea.

SMITH COLLEGE

SIDNEY N. DEANE

VICI FABER FERRARIUS

THE VILLAGE BLACKSMITH (*H. W. Longfellow*)

Vici castanea sub patula fabri
ferrari focus est; multa faber valet
nervosis manibus; bracchia musculis
turgent quos reputes vincula ferrea.

Longa et crista coma est nigraque. Tempora
subfuscata ut corium; sudor honestior
manat fronte gravi; insta facit lucra,
adspectatque homines debita nesciens.

Mane et vesperi enim murmura folium
aures percipiunt, mallei et audiunt
lentum ictum numero dispositum bono;
sic campana sonat solis ad exitum.

Laetantur pueri, cum redeunt scholis,
valvis a patulis conspicere aut focum,
aut audire sonos folium et adsequi
scintillas: volitant ut palea areae.

Sacramento die templum adit, et sedet
cum natis; parochi prosequitur preces
sermonesque pios; filia concinens
dulci voce sua cor patris erigit. *

Natae vox similis coniugis: haec diu
in caelo recinit! Quis modo dormiat!
sub glaeba meditans, ex oculis piam
exterget lacrimam non tenera manu.

Sudans, nunc hilaris nuncque dolens, iter
vitae prosequitur; mane quod incipit
complet vesper: opus factum aliquod, novum
iam coepit requiem nocte parat bonam.

Gratus sum, faber, hoc quod doceas: "Focis
vitae in flammigeris nostra paranda sors;
incede in resona fingere nos decet
mentis consilium quodlibet aut opus".

E COLLEGIO CAMPIONE PRATOCANENSIS,
WISCONSIN, A. D. V. Kal. Ian. MCMXXIII

A. P. GEYSER, S. J.

*Now she is merely sleeping.'